

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 and 13-26 are pending in the application. Claims 20, 23 and 24 have been allowed.

With this Amendment, claims 1, 21, 25 and 26 have been amended in order to further define the invention. No new matter has been added. The limitations of claims 13 and 14 regarding glue or a weld connecting at least one section of the common wall section to the peripheral wall have been added to the independent claims. Furthermore, the limitation added to claims 1, 25 and 26 regarding the curved edge section merging into an essentially horizontal lid bottom middle section, for example see reference no. 12 in the figures, is disclosed in numerous places in the specification, see for example page 5, last full paragraph, page 8, last full paragraph, and page 9 first and last full paragraphs. Claim 21 now states that the central area of the lid bottom includes a connecting tube that is connected to the essentially horizontal lid bottom middle section, see page 11, first full paragraph, for example. Accordingly, no new matter has been added.

Claims 1-4, 6-8, 16, 18 and 25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Baumann, U.S. Patent No. 2,904,182. Claims 13 and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Baumann '182. Claims 5, 17 and 26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Baumann '182 in view of Verlinden, U.S. Patent No. 3,952,904. Claims 9, 10 and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Baumann '182 in view of Watts, U.S. Patent No. 3,021,974.

It is respectfully submitted that the Baumann reference alone, or in combination with the other references, cannot anticipate nor render obvious independent claims 1, 25 and 26.

Baumann teaches a filter unit comprising a housing 1 shown of cylindrical form having a cylindrical bore 2, therein closed at the upper end by a domed closure 3 threaded into an enlargement of the bore 2, see Col. 2, lines 43-46. The filter element 16 is held in the position of Figure 2 by means of a removable bowl 30, forming a sediment reservoir, threaded into a lower end of housing 1. The tubular projection 31 engages filter element 16 clamping it firmly against the partition 12 of the valve which is

fixed in the open limit position by the domed closure 3, see for example Col. 3, lines 36-48. Therefore, the pressure load of the bowls is concentrated on the domed shaped part.

Figure 2 of Baumann illustrates that bowl 30 includes a short upper wall section, i.e., bottom of Figure 2, and a very long lower wall section, the lower part thereof not contacting the peripheral wall of the housing 1. Therefore, only the upper wall section is fitted at the inner side of the peripheral wall. To the contrary, independent claims 1, 25 and 26 claim that the strip-shaped lateral wall is fitted at the inner side of the peripheral wall. As described in Applicants' specification, for example see page 4, the force component presses the common wall section against the peripheral wall of the cartridge container. Baumann does not include a scope and content that teaches the claimed limitation. Instead, Baumann teaches an O- or sealing ring 32 to reportedly provide a liquid tight seal around bowl 30, see Col. 3, lines 47-48. In view of Baumann, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be led in the direction taken by the inventors.

Moreover, independent claims 1, 25 and 26 state that glue or a weld connects at least one section of the common wall section to the peripheral wall. To the contrary, Baumann teaches the use of threads to connect the bowl 30 to the bore of the housing 1. One of ordinary skill in the art would not be led to utilize glue or a weld to connect at least one section of the common wall section to the peripheral wall in view of the teachings of Baumann.

Furthermore, independent claims 1, 25 and 26 claim that the curved edge section merges into an essentially horizontal lid bottom middle section. As described on pages 9 and 10 of the specification, forces are generated by internal pressure on the lid bottom such as in essentially horizontal lid bottom middle section as claimed, see for example FIG 2b. The claimed lid bottom having a horizontal middle section connecting to the curved edge section, along with glue or a weld connecting at least one section of the common wall section to the peripheral wall, can be utilized as the inside pressure presses on the common wall section 15 and thus exerts an additional sealing force, especially in the weld section 19, as illustrated in FIG. 2b. Moreover, Baumann does not teach a curved edge section, but to the contrary, an entirely curved lid bottom. As indicated hereinabove, bowl 30 carries central tubular projection 31 on the inside

thereof for engaging filter element 16 and clamping it firmly against partition 12 of the valve which is fixed in the open limit position by domed closure 3. Baumann cannot anticipate nor provide a scope and content that discloses independent claims 1, 25 and 26.

Likewise, the Verlinden reference discloses a beer barrel having an end part 3. As described in Col. 3, lines 32-47, ultrasonic welding generates heat that melts the plastic material of portion 12 and peripheral wall 13 to fix the upper wall section of the end part 3 to the barrel. The weld section at the upper wall section, as disclosed in Verlinden may cause a problem. The lower wall section can be loosened under pressure and pressurized fluid can penetrate into the space between the lower wall section and the peripheral wall. This effect can cause high shear forces to act on the welding point. Accordingly, Verlinden also cannot anticipate nor provide a scope and content that teaches wherein the weld connects at least one section of the common wall section to the peripheral wall.

Furthermore, Verlinden completely lacks the claimed essentially horizontal lid bottom middle section. In fact, Verlinden teaches curved bowl section 13a that extends about 71% of the radius of lid or end part 3, see FIG. 1.

Regarding claims 9, 10 and 19, the Examiner cites the Watts reference in combination with Baumann, but does not provide any further description of the rejection. It is unclear how the Watts reference will be applied in view of Baumann to render the indicated claims obvious.

Claims 1-8, 13-14, 16-18, 25 and 26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Vannoy et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,830,348, in view of Verlinden '904. Claims 9, 10 and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vannoy '348 in view of Verlinden '904 and further in view of Stifano, U.S. Patent No. 4,109,820. Claim 21 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Vannoy '348 in view of Verlinden '904 and Stifano '820. Claim 15 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Vannoy '348 in view of Verlinden '904 and Gizowski et al., U.S. Publication No. 2001/0000894.

It is respectfully submitted that Vannoy and the various combinations of the additionally cited references cannot render the claimed invention obvious. As argued in our prior correspondence, Vannoy cannot provide a scope and content that teaches Applicants' claimed common wall section, which is an essential feature of the invention. The common wall section of the invention belongs to both the curved edge section 14 as well as to lateral wall 16, such as shown in Fig. 2A. As further defined in claim 3, the common wall section is part of the lateral wall and forms a lower wall section 18 of the lateral wall.

As claimed in claim 1, lateral wall 16 is strip-shaped and fitted at the inner side of the peripheral wall. As such, the lateral wall extends in a vertical direction, parallel to the peripheral wall and the inwardly curved edge section of the lid bottom merges with the lateral wall distant from the lower end of the lateral wall.

Accordingly, as claimed, the common wall section is parallel to the peripheral wall adjacent to the peripheral wall, as shown in Applicants' noted drawings. To the contrary, the Vannoy common wall cited by the Examiner shows a horizontal connecting section between the curved section and the vertical lateral wall, and cannot anticipate nor teach or suggest Applicants' claimed common wall section parallel to the peripheral wall.

Such a horizontal section taught by Vannoy can be dangerous, because high pressure inside the container can lead to loosening of the lower part of the lateral wall section. As described on page 2, first paragraph of the specification, such as a lid taught by Vannoy is subject to upward oriented forces that act on the lid bottom that can lead to loosening of the lid.

Moreover, in respect to independent claims 1, 25 and 26, Vannoy cannot teach the curved edge section merging into an essentially horizontal lid bottom middle section. Furthermore, Vannoy lacks glue or a weld connecting at least one section of the common wall section to the peripheral wall.

As indicated hereinabove, Verlinden cannot teach or suggest numerous features of Applicants' independent claims 1, 25 and 26. Like Vannoy, Verlinden also cannot anticipate nor provide a scope and content that teaches wherein glue or a weld connects at least one section of the common wall section to the peripheral wall.

Furthermore, Verlinden completely lacks the claimed essentially horizontal lid bottom middle section. In fact, Verlinden teaches bowl section 13a that extends about 71% of the radius of lid or end part 3. Accordingly, it is unclear how one of ordinary skill in the art would be taught to combine the distinct features of the Vannoy reference with those of the Verlinden reference.

Regarding the remaining dependent claims, the Examiner has pieced together isolated features from the prior art references using hindsight to impermissibly arrive at Applicants' claimed invention.

It is respectfully submitted that the Applicants' specifically defined inventions show more than predictable results of the combination of Vannoy and Verlinden and for Vannoy and Verlinden and Stifano or Gizowski. In fact, it is unclear what a person of ordinary skill in the art would have known or could have done when in possession of the references to arrive at the specifically claimed inventions.

Should the Examiner have any questions regarding this response, a telephone call to the undersigned is greatly appreciated.

Respectfully submitted

HUDAK, SHUNK & FARINE CO. LPA



Daniel J. Hudak, Jr.
Registration No. 47,669

DJHjr/js

2020 Front St., Suite 307
Cuyahoga Falls, OH 44221
330-535-2220
Attorney Docket No.: FMW-CQ-PCT-US